



**Texas Department of Insurance**  
**Division of Workers' Compensation**  
Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48  
7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1609

## MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

### PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address:  CORPUS CHRISTI MEDICAL CENTER 3701 KIRBY DRIVE SUITE 1288 HOUSTON TX 77098-3926	MFDR Tracking #: M4-07-4895-01  DWC Claim #:  Injured Employee:
Respondent Name and Carrier's Austin Representative Box #:  TRANSCONTINENTAL INSURANCE CO Box #: 47	Date of Injury:  Employer Name:  Insurance Carrier #:

### PART II: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

**Requestor's Position Summary:** "Per Rule 134.401(c)(6)(A)(i)(iii), once the bill has reached the minimum stop-loss threshold of \$40K, the entire admission will be paid using the stop-loss reimbursement factor ('SLRF') of 75%."

**Amount in Dispute:** \$8,782.87

### PART III: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

**Respondent's Position Summary:** "For the dates of service in dispute, Provider billed Carrier a total of \$72,898.00. Carrier reimbursed Provider \$45,890.63. Provider seeks additional reimbursement of \$8,782.87. For the reasons stated below, Provider is not entitled to additional reimbursement." "...Provider is asserting that the stop-loss methodology applies to determine reimbursement for this admission. However, the Provider is incorrect. This was a trauma admission. Therefore, the stop-loss methodology does not apply. Instead, reimbursement for the entire admission is at a 'fair and reasonable' rate."

**Response Submitted by:** James M. Loughlin, Stone Loughlin & Swanson, LLP, P.O. Box 30111 Austin, TX 78755

### PART IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code(s)	Disputed Service	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
4/5/2006 through 4/13/2006	45, 900-021, 96, 993, 97, 855-013, W10, 855-016, W12, 855-010	Inpatient Surgery Admission	\$8,782.87	\$0.00
<b>Total Due:</b>				<b>\$0.00</b>

### PART V: REVIEW OF SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY AND EXPLANATION

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), titled *Reimbursement Policies and Guidelines*, and Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, titled *Use of the Fee Guidelines*, effective May 16, 2002 set out the reimbursement guidelines.

This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on April 4, 2007.

- For the services involved in this dispute, the respondent reduced or denied payment with reason code(s):
  - 45-Charges exceed your contracted/legislated fee arrangement.
  - 900-021-Any network reduction is in accordance with the network referenced above.
  - 96-Non-covered charges.
  - 993-This service is not reimbursable.
  - 97-Payment is included in the allowance for another service/procedure.
  - 855-013-Payment denied-The service is included in the global value of another billed procedure.
  - W10-No maximum allowable defined by fee guideline. Reimbursement made based on insurance carrier fair and

reasonable reimbursement methodology.

- 855-016-Payment recommended at fair and reasonable rate.
- W12-Extent of injury. Not finally adjudicated.
- 855-010-NC (Non-covered) procedure or service, payment denied.
- Rev 110: Private room not covered under workers compensation.
- Rev 278: Please resubmit with implant invoices.
- Rev 300: Venipuncture included in fee for lab tests.
- Rev 301: Bedside fingerstick glucose testing is routine nursing duty included in fee for ER/Room & Board.
- Rev 450 & 761: Injection & IV therapy are routine nursing duties included in fee for ER visit.
- Rev 730: ("EKG Tracking only") monitoring is included in fee for ER visit.

2. The Respondent raised the issue of a PPO contract; however, a review of the submitted EOBs does not support a PPO reduction was taken. The respondent did not submit a copy of a contractual agreement to support this EOB denial; therefore, the disputed services will be reviewed in accordance with applicable Division rules and fee guidelines.
3. The respondent denied reimbursement for revenue code 110 for the private room based upon "W12-Extent of injury. Not finally adjudicated" and "855-010-NC (Non-covered) procedure or service, payment denied." The Division finds that per Division rule at 28 TAC §134.401(b)(2)(C) "All charges submitted are subject to audit as described in Commission rules". A review of the Division records does not support an extent of injury issue exist; therefore, the disputed services will be reviewed in accordance with applicable Division rules and fee guidelines.
4. This dispute relates to inpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.401(c)(5)(A), effective August 1, 1997, 22 TexReg 6264, which requires that when "Trauma (ICD-9 codes 800.0-959.50)" diagnosis codes are listed as the primary diagnosis, reimbursement for the entire admission shall be at a fair and reasonable rate. Review of box 67 on the hospital bill finds that the principle diagnosis code is listed as 823.30. The Division therefore determines that this inpatient admission shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate pursuant to Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1 and Texas Labor Code §413.011(d).
5. The requestor asks for reimbursement under the stop loss provision of the Division's *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline* found in Division rule at 28 TAC §134.401(c)(6). The requestor asserts in the position statement that "Per Rule 134.401(c)(6)(A)(i)(iii), once the bill has reached the minimum stop-loss threshold of \$40K, the entire admission will be paid using the stop-loss reimbursement factor ('SLRF') of 75%." Division rule at 28 TAC §134.401(c)(6), effective August 1, 1997, 22 TexReg 6264, states, in part, that "The diagnosis codes specified in paragraph (5) of this subsection are exempt from the stop-loss methodology and the entire admission shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate." As stated above, the Division has found that the primary diagnosis is a code specified in Division rule at 28 TAC §134.401(c)(5); therefore, the disputed services are exempt from the stop-loss methodology and the entire admission shall be reimbursed at a fair and reasonable rate pursuant to Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1.
6. Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1, effective May 16, 2002, 27 TexReg 4047, requires that "Reimbursement for services not identified in an established fee guideline shall be reimbursed at fair and reasonable rates as described in the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, §413.011 until such period that specific fee guidelines are established by the commission."
7. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
8. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(E), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires that the request shall include "a copy of all applicable medical records specific to the dates of service in dispute." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor has not provided copies of all medical records pertinent to the services in dispute. Although the requestor did submit a copy of the operative report, the requestor did not submit a copy of the anesthesia record or other pertinent medical records sufficient to support the services in dispute. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(E).
9. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires that the request shall include a position statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue." Review of the requestor's documentation finds that the requestor has not discussed how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the

requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv).

10. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(c)(2)(G), effective December 31, 2006, 31 TexReg 10314, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 15, 2007, requires the requestor to provide “documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement in accordance with §134.1 of this title (relating to Medical Reimbursement) when the dispute involves health care for which the Division has not established a maximum allowable reimbursement (MAR), as applicable.” Review of the submitted documentation finds that:

- The requestor’s position statement states that “Per Rule 134.401(c)(6)(A)(i)(iii), once the bill has reached the minimum stop-loss threshold of \$40K, the entire admission will be paid using the stop-loss reimbursement factor (‘SLRF’) of 75%.”
- The requestor does not discuss or explain how payment of \$8,782.87 would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement.
- The requestor seeks reimbursement for this admission based upon the stop-loss reimbursement methodology which is not applicable per Division rule at 28 TAC §134.401(c)(6).
- The requestor did not submit documentation to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement.
- The Division has previously found that a reimbursement methodology based upon payment of a hospital’s billed charges, or a percentage of billed charges, does not produce an acceptable payment amount. This methodology was considered and rejected by the Division in the *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline* adoption preamble which states at 22 Texas Register 6276 (July 4, 1997) that:

“A discount from billed charges was another method of reimbursement which was considered. Again, this method was found unacceptable because it leaves the ultimate reimbursement in the control of the hospital, thus defeating the statutory objective of effective cost control and the statutory standard not to pay more than for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living. It also provides no incentive to contain medical costs, would be administratively burdensome for the Commission and system participants, and would require additional Commission resources.”

- The requestor does not discuss or explain how payment of the requested amount would satisfy the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1.
- The requestor did not discuss or support that the proposed methodology would ensure that similar procedures provided in similar circumstances receive similar reimbursement.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

11. The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rules at 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(c)(2)(E), §133.307(c)(2)(F)(iv) and §133.307(c)(2)(G). The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$0.00.

#### **PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES**

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), §413.031 and §413.0311  
28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307, §134.1, §134.401  
Texas Government Code, Chapter 2001, Subchapter G

#### **PART VII: DIVISION DECISION**

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute.

#### **DECISION:**

**8/26/2011**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Authorized Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

## **PART VIII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL**

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with other required information specified in Division rule at 28 TAC §148.3(c).

Under Texas Labor Code §413.0311, your appeal will be handled by a Division hearing under Title 28 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 142 Rules if the total amount sought does not exceed \$2,000. If the total amount sought exceeds \$2,000, a hearing will be conducted by the State Office of Administrative Hearings under Texas Labor Code §413.031.

**Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.**